

**From:** Patrick Gluzinski  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:00 AM  
**Subject:** STOP THE LOOSENING OF THE RULES!!!!

Can any of you honestly give me 1 concrete benefit to the public by easing the restrictions on media ownership?

I'll wait to hear from you.

The last set of ownership rule changes have produced nothing but an increase in difficulty for communities to communicate to their own populations. Commercial radio is generic and vile. People in South Dakota died from a major ammonia spill... to which they could have been alerted via radio... had not every station in the market been operated by one company who happened to be on air, asleep-at-the-wheel. No need to mention which company, I'm sure it's obvious.

Why aren't you people protecting us from that kind of behavior. Why are you considering this! So, lose in court and lose again, but damnit, fight for us!

Patrick Gluzinski

---

McAfee VirusScan Online from the Netscape Network.  
Comprehensive protection for your entire computer. Get your free trial today!  
<http://channels.netscape.com/ns/computing/mcafee/index.jsp?promo=393397>

Get AOL Instant Messenger 5.1 free of charge. Download Now!  
<http://aim.aol.com/aimnew/Aim/register.adp?promo=380455>

**From:** Mrs. Shirley Green  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:05 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Mrs. Shirley Green (haroldshirleygreen@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I know that the three Republicans on the Commission are in favor of further deregulation of the media, and I understand that they believe that this will be a more efficient system, given the abundance of cable, internet and satellite availabilities.

Sir, I respectfully request that you open this to public debate, in which all media outlets are required to post notice and invite comments from the public.

The news coverage from the major television and radio outlets of the last few years has been very unimpressive and shallow. I cannot imagine that their involvement in local and state issues would enhance public awareness of matters relevant to us.

For this reason, I am completely against this deregulation. Further, I encourage you and the Commission members to go in the OTHER direction, back to regulation. The airwaves are public property, and for this democracy to function appropriately, all points of view must be made possible for public consideration.

Going in your chosen direction could result in totalitarianism. You are probably aware of that possibility. So, I must insist that the public good is served and not corporate interests.

Sincerely,

Shirley Green  
Sunol, CA

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 67.74.32.117  
Remote IP address: 67.74.32 117

**From:** Jane Tisdel  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:14 AM  
**Subject:** June 2 meeting

For all the good it will do...I'm writing to urge that your commission NOT lower the current restrictions on media ownership. There is already too much concentration of power and control (thanks largely to the telecommunications act in 96). Lord Acton was right, you know.

I would remind you that the FCC was created to serve the public and protect the public interest - not to serve the corporations you should be regulating.

Jane Tisdel  
302 Hackberry Ave.  
Modesto, CA 95354

**CC:** 'senator@boxer.senate.gov', 'senator@feinstein.senate.gov'

**From:** Georgina Morris  
**To:** Michael Copps, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, kjmwebb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:42 AM  
**Subject:** DO NOT ALLOW MEDIA MONOPOLIES IN THE USA (VOTE NO TODAY)

---

STOP MORE SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

**From:** MMW2000USA@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:43 AM  
**Subject:** Communications Regulations

Please do not deregulate the communications industries.

An extremely concerned citizen,

Patricia Schaeffer  
850 Russell Ave.  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

**From:** Anastaszi@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:52 AM  
**Subject:** FCC OWNERSHIP RULE CHANGES

Dear Sir:

I am adamantly against any changes in the current rules regarding ownership limits in broadcast, print, and other media.

It is already difficult enough to get adequate information, unbiased, truthful, and accurate under the current rules. Changing them, i.e. loosening ownership limits, will only move us closer to monopolization of the airwaves - which are owned by the people, and should not be sold to the highest bidder.

Please vote against any changes.

Sincerely,

Dennis Dieterich  
San Francisco, California

**From:** Jason Matthews  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:55 AM  
**Subject:** Vote NO on deregulation

Members of the Federal Communications Commission:

I am not a traditional issue-driven and ideological letter-writer, however, the issue of relaxation of existing media ownership rules forces me to urge each of you to vote against such an action.

As stated in the mission of the FCC, the airways belong to the public and in today's increasingly global and corporate-dominated world, more regulation - not less - is needed to preserve this principle and to protect the identities and economic vitalities of communities across America.

As we all know, America does not have state-sponsored media. Such an entity would be a threat to the principle of a free press and of free speech as embodied First Amendment. Consolidated and centralized corporate media control can, and ultimately will be, as a great a threat to the First Amendment. This should not be an issue of economic profit as much as this should be an issue of the public good. In Minot, North Dakota not a single radio station is locally owned. Most programming is pre-recorded and transmitted from out-of-state. The result? A decrease in the public discussion of local issues and a disturbing decrease in community cultural and event-centered programming. Such programming unites communities and enlivens our democracy.

Further deregulation threatens not only the free market of ideas - which are the cornerstones of our democracy - but also the free market of capitalistic competition - which is the hallmark of our economy. Further deregulation harms not only the media consumer but also the small and visionary American entrepreneur.

In conclusion, I would remind the FCC of the adage that "information is power" and remind the commission that such power in the hands of a monied few is power misplaced and power that can easily be abused. Please stand up for fair competition and the rights of the consumer - vote no today

Sincerely,

Jason Matthews  
Bismarck, North Dakota

---

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE\*.

**CC:** matthewsjason@hotmail.com

**From:** David Morris  
**To:** Michael Copps, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, kjmwebb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:56 AM  
**Subject:** DO NOT ALLOW MEDIA MONOPOLIES IN THE USA (VOTE NO TODAY)

DO NOT ALLOW MEDIA MONOPOLIES IN THE USA (VOTE NO TODAY)

---

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

**From:** courtney hickman  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, FCC FCCINFO, Campaignlaw  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 4:00 AM  
**Subject:** to inform and be informed

To Whom This May Concern:

I am an 18 year-old journalism student in Missouri.  
I write because the recent discussion of easing the laws that currently govern the ownership of newspapers, television and radio stations concerns me very much.

As a journalism student I not only appreciate, but relish the ability Americans have to inform and be informed through free press. My concern is; were these laws to be relaxed and a wave of mergers followed, it could put our freedom in dire jeopardy. I'm not naive I know media corporations already decide for the most part what we think, but please, I beg you, put politics and money aside and think of future generations.

Freedom of speech helped make America great and still sets our country apart today as a world leader. Don't put money before the ability for Americans to gather free unbiased news. This news helps free thinking Americans form their own opinions and those opinions and beliefs motivate and inspire people to do great things.

I know this e-mail may not make a difference, it may not even reach those it was intended for, but without practicing free speech and expressing one's opinion to those in power how can we expect to keep those rights. Please, don't throw free press out the window for the sake of politics and a pay off.

Courtney Hickman

342 W Kansas  
Liberty MO  
64068

(816) 792-1699

saraswati20@hotmail.com

---

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service: 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

**From:** Randy Gaul  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 4:01 AM  
**Subject:** Rule Changes

Sirs:

My message is very simple. No rule changes concentrating ownership. This country does not exist for the likes of Rupert Murdoch. Thank you.

Randolph A Gaul  
Baltimore

**From:** Frank Tobin  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 4:02 AM  
**Subject:** my opposition to Monday's proposed rule change

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed changes that are to be voted on Monday. The proposed changes will not increase diversity in media. To back up my claim, all I need to do is to point to the complete lack of coverage of this issue by any news outlet of any major corporation. To relax the consolidation rules would \*exaggerate\* the situation; any information which would negatively impact the major news organizations would be even further removed from the public view. More dangerously, one can \*easily\* see this spreading into the realm of political viewpoints as well. It is truly a frightening idea.

Purely free markets are a nice ideology, but history has shown that when it comes to industries such as media and telecom organizations, the gorillas cannot be let loose unchained. A 'free market' requires a viable free choice by the consumer; when the avenues through which the product is sold (e.g., media forums or spectrum) are for all purposes finite and monopolized by a few, gargantuan players, there is no chance for a flourishing diversity.

\*Please\* vote against the proposed rule changes.

--

Frank Tobin

<http://www.neverending.org/~ftobin/>

**From:** James Pray  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 4:33 AM  
**Subject:** Diverse Media

Dear Commissioner Powell,

I implore you and your fellow commissioners to delay any vote on media consolidation until there can be a full and open public debate on this issue which so severely threatens our First Amendment freedoms.

Sincerely,

James Pray

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** PAPPETE@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 5:19 AM  
**Subject:** 6-02-03 Commission Meeting

Dear Commissioner Abernathy;

I urge you to strengthen, not loosen, protections for diversity in our broadcast and print media. America cannot remain a Democracy without free and open debate and all opinions having a voice.

Sincerely,

Elaine Mitchell

**From:** Jim Piazza  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 5:21 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Jim Piazza (jap@ix.netcom.com) writes:

Hello,

I believe that having a company own more avenue of communication in a market is bad for the consumer. This could limit the type of information that we receive. That company, could for its own interest, not present information that could hurt its position on a topic. For instance I have herd no mention of this hearing and what could happen on a Clear Channel owned station. What if they were the only or major owners of communications in this market? Would we ever get the full story on a topic that could hurt their position? Please do not let this happen. Vote against loosing the rules.

Thank You  
Jim Piazza

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.175.88.48  
Remote IP address: 216.175.88.48

**From:** PAPPETE@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 5:35 AM  
**Subject:** 6-2-03 Commission Meeting

Dear Commissioner Adelstein;

I urge you to strengthen, not loosen, protections for diversity in our broadcast and print media. America needs to hear all opinions in free and open debate and expression to remain a democracy.

Sincerely,

Elaine Mitchell

**From:** henry gross  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 5:41 AM  
**Subject:** Don't Rush to Relax Ownership Rules

"I am deeply concerned that you have set a June 2 deadline for submitting new regulations on media ownership. Media consolidation is a threat to the free flow of information and ideas, and it is wrong to issue new rules without giving the public an opportunity to review and discuss specific proposed regulations. An issue this important needs more debate and discussion. Please do not stifle debate on this issue."

---

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB

**From:** John Ervin  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 5:43 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Do not unregulate Media

Harriet Ervin <htervin@fea.net> wrote:

From Harriet Ervin Sat May 31 10:58:53 2003  
X-Apparently-To: muservin@yahoo.com via 216.136.173.200; 02 Jun 2003 02:38:31 -0700 (PDT)  
Return-Path:  
Received: from 216.115.224.15 (EHLO smtp.fea.net) (216.115.224.15)  
by mta210.mail.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 02 Jun 2003 02:38:31 -0700 (PDT)  
Received: from fea.net [216.115.226.94] by smtp.fea.net with ESMTP  
(SMTPD32-7.15) id AD3524BD0026; Mon, 02 Jun 2003 02:47:33 -0700  
Message-ID: <3ED8ED5D.264A4EED@fea.net>  
Date: Sat, 31 May 2003 10:58:53 -0700  
From: Harriet Ervin  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD ezn/58/n (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: mpowell@fcc.gov, muservin@yahoo.com  
Subject: Do not unregulate Media  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Length: 832

The proposed plan of selling our media to the highest bidder will have disastrous effects on America. It's bad enough as it is. Please, do not let night fall on our country. Remember, if you must, that He stands and watches these programs with his sleepless eye. And we must one day answer to Him. No more media monopolies. It is an assault upon local and national values, and will have negative ripples throughout the world. If media will be sold, God's voice will not, and that is "media" that will thunder out against this incursion on the American people, and the world village. Please do not let Murdoch and the usual suspects run rough-shod over our needs for the truth on the airwaves. The moral arc of the universe, and the airwaves, is long, but it bends toward justice..... Sincerely, John and Harriet Ervin

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

**From:** ZGENE3@cs.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 6:47 AM  
**Subject:** Do not support proposed "broadcast ownership rules"

To: The Honorable Michael K. Powell, Chairman;  
The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner;  
The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner;  
The Honorable Kevin J. Martin, Commissioner;  
The Honorable Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner

I strongly disagree with the proposed "broadcast ownership rules" . Plesae do not support these proposed rules.

- If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.
- Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.
- The FCC, controlled by five unelected officials, has conducted its decision-making process with only one public hearing and very little time for the public to react.
- Many of the corporations fighting for these rule changes -- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC -- demonstrate a strong anti-gun bias in their news coverage and programming.

Sioncerely,  
Ed Generazio  
304 Coach Hovis Dr.  
Yorktown, VA 23693

**From:** Michael Flanagan  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 6:51 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Michael Flanagan (michael\_flanagan@msn.com) writes:

Please vote NO today.Thank you.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.128.213.70  
Remote IP address: 68.128.213.70

**From:** Ntfarns@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 6:58 AM  
**Subject:** please do not relax multiple ownership/license rules.

please do not relax multiple ownership/license rules.  
thanks

tom farnsworth  
2712 dixon creek lane  
fort collins co 80526

**From:** Sfriedl3@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 6:59 AM  
**Subject:** new broadcast rules

Too few people already own too much media. Do the right thing and vpte  
against consolidating media ownership in even fewer hands.

Sue Friedlander  
Fayetteville, North Carolina

**From:** maria hrabowski  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:10 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

maria hrabowski (jmhrab@norwoodlight.com) writes:

I had lived in a country that had government monopoly on news. Now I will be living in the country that allows media monopoly to exist. It seems I went back via extreme capitalism to the stalinist nightmare. Instead of news you get propaganda without possibility to argue or dissent. By timing, by excluding some news and inflating other news organizations have already been succesful in manipulating instead of informing American news customers. It will get worse because of your desire to deregulate rules. You are creating prison cells for minds and psychiatric wards for independent souls. I have never expected that cynical players could bring us worse kind of soccialism via unrestrained, brazen assult on social rules. YOu bring us Orwell society. And I did believe that it was the book about communism, not it is a book about world you are creating right now Maybe because you are greedy, maybe because you are stupid or unexperience, maybe because youa are stupid, and g! reedy for power and money. It is the worst thing I experienced in a political life in America.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 65.166.217.96  
Remote IP address: 65.166.217.96

**From:** Gary Press  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:30 AM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

Please don't let your associates sell out to the media giants.

They must be constantly reminded them of their mandate - that they are there to protect:

"The public interest, convenience and necessity."

Thank you,

Gary Press

**From:** Marty Craddock  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:52 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Marty Craddock (martycr@flash.net) writes:

Please vote no on the rules change you are considering this am.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.116.143.193  
Remote IP address: 68.116.143.193

**From:** Elise Glickman  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:55 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Elise Glickman (eliseglickman@yahoo.com) writes:

This is the first time I have ever felt compelled to protest. As a member of the media, and a concerned citizen in favor of diversity, I must exhort you NOT to vote in favor of this ruling today. Having lived abroad for 13 years, I am shocked by the media in this country, our news is heard around the world.

Elise Glickman

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.75.161.177  
Remote IP address: 68.75.161.177

**From:** Betty Langsam  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 7:56 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Betty Langsam (Blangsam@aol.com) writes:

Commisioner Adelstein,  
Please, for the sake of our nation, do not vote to make the proposed changes on ownership of radio  
stations television stations and newspapers.  
Betty Langsam  
Short Hills, New Jersey

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.37.168.53  
Remote IP address: 68.37.168.53

**From:** Klupin@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 8:14 AM  
**Subject:** (no subject)

Dear Commissioner Abernathy:

I am political scientist, American citizen, and advocate of democracy in America. I have been following the issue of changed FCC regulations and am extremely concerned about the far-reaching ramifications these changes will have on our society and the ability of the average citizen to obtain complete information. We live in an information era - the internet connects us worldwide, and I have long advocated the major role - the major responsibility - a free press has to the citizens of any democracy. Today, unfortunately, many Americans have to resort to internet media in other countries to be able to obtain the "complete" picture of news in our society, and I am actually confused that the FCC is under the belief that changing the rules so that fewer corporations will be able to control most of our airwaves will actually have the effect of controlling our access to the news. This may have been a successful tactic in the 50's or even 60's but in today's "shrinking" world, this just won't work, and will only succeed in further tarnishing the image our good country has in actually promoting the principles of our founding fathers. I am proud to be an American. I have lived abroad and know the strengths of our country and the wonderful beliefs that its founders had in developing our framework for government. Today's events will affect everyone in our country, and as I help my middle-school sons study American history and proudly discuss with them the exciting and motivating history of our country, I am terribly disheartened to think what world we are leading them to, when our media will be limited to the views of a few towering megacorporations. This not only damages the ability of interested citizens to obtain the complete picture of information, it weakens the very premise of democracy our country was founded on. It will, sooner or later, force us back to the days of the Samuel Adams, when citizens had to take it upon themselves to ensure full disclosure of information among the states. Please vote against these rule changes. They are disservice to every American today.

Sincerely,

Kristen Lupin

**From:** Jacklilley@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 8:24 AM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership

Dear Madam

I am very concerned that relaxing broadcast ownership rules will adversely affect the public's opportunity to hear unbiased news.

Please listen to us.

Sincerely

John R. Lilley II  
4315 Aldie Road  
Catharpin, VA 20143

**From:** Dan Dangel  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:43 PM  
**Subject:** Let's Do Our Jobs.

Dear FCC Commissioner:

Why do you continue to disregard your obligation to protect our families from the constant barrage of indecency on television and radio? If you don't stop the decline in decency, who will?

The air waves are not to appeal to our worst interests, but our best. Why should our public property be used to pander to the "anything goes for a profit" interests?

As parents, we are looking out for the next generation - and as FCC Commissioners, I would expect you to do the same. There are plenty of private channels for those seeking adult interests to find their material, without allowing the public waves to deteriorate.

Doing the right thing, isn't always popular.

Sincerely,

Dan Dangel  
dan@dangelcpa.com

**From:** Clifford Mead  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps  
**Date:** Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:50 PM  
**Subject:** Loosening rules for media ownership

I strongly protest and disagree with the FCC's decision today. This will only serve to further dumb-down the already brainwashed public who isn't smart enough to get their news from the BBC and the other internet websites. There is already too much right wing Zionism/Military Industrial complex on the one hand, and left wing Marxism propaganda on the other hand, rammed down our throats here in AMERIKA. Where are the sane middle opinions?? Why should big money dictate what the public sees and hears??

In my opinion the FCC has been run for too long by LAWYERS and POLITICAL appointees instead of Electronic Engineers and people who know the technical side of broadcasting! NO ONE OWNS the electromagnetic spectrum, it belongs to the people of each sovereign nation, and it should NOT take bribes and MILLIONS of dollars to get a TV or Radio station license!! Remember what Newton Minow said back in the 1970s-TV IS A VAST WASTELAND. This is even truer nowadays....

Yours,  
Clifford J Mead  
Salem, NH 03079

**CC:** KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein